



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_11156
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of CaCO ₃ and Kaolin Filler Loadings on Curing Rates of Polyurethane Foams
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 16: kaolin filled foams than CaCO₃ filled foams, with the free..... Line 29: (plastics, composites, etc) Line 68: Chen et al. [7] delete (2002) Line 121: associated free alumina in the form..... Line 154: graciously supplied not gratefully supplied Line 167: Korean Fine Chemicals or Fire Chemicals ?? Line 171: analytical grades Line 190: of not OF Line 193: IR spectra analysis of castor oil is not shown anywhere in the report. The report is also silent on what castor oil was used for. This is a major omission and should be addressed. Line 215: constant for the sample Line 225: sample aliquots of what? You should be more explicit. Line 252: In this respect, ...delete 'of the present study' Line 356: They are, however, higher..... Line 406: They are, however, much higher..... Line 448: "tensile strength, creep recovery and compression set", these properties were not determined or reported anywhere in the manuscript, neither in the experimental procedure nor the results and discussion section. You may show the relation, if any, between curing rate and these mechanical properties and lucidly explain same in your result and discussion section. Perhaps this could justify such inclusion in the conclusion. Otherwise you cannot conclude on what was	Accepted Accepted Fire Chemicals Accepted There was a mixed up. Castor oil is not part of study. Mixed up is regretted. Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted. There was a mixed up. These properties are not part of present study. Error is regretted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	neither determined nor discussed. Line 473: use of raw material. Line 495: reference [6] is not completely listed, no journal name, volume, issue, page numbers Line 512: African Journal of Natural Sciences, 12: 25 – 36 Line 514, 527,530,533: you should be consistent in your listing style in all your references. For example reference [14] should be listed thus: Dalen, M.B. (2009). Infra-red characterization of some prepared vegetable oil polyamides. African Journal of Natural Science, 12, 25 - 36.	Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		